

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor for participating in the interview held on October 24, 2007. The prior art was discussed and it was agreed that a new office action (i.e., the present office action) would be issued.

In the final office action dated November 13, 2007, all claims 1-24 were rejected. Applicants are amending claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 19 and 23, which are the independent claims. Favorable consideration of the claims as amended is requested.

Independent method claims 1 and 7, and respective corresponding computer program product claims 13 and 19, are being amended to recite that the navigation menu is managed separately from the registered portal page, and that when the navigation menu emulates a selection of a navigation option, it does so separately from the registered portal page. These amendments are supported by the present disclosure, for example by the menu 48 shown in FIGS. 7 and 8. Particularly, the specification describes that the portal page 50a (FIG. 7) includes the navigation menu 48 and also "an instantiated web page 51a". [Spec. 13:10-23.] Thus, in the illustrated example, it is clear that the page 51a (which contains the substantive content being displayed) and the menu 58 are separate parts of the portal page 50a. Separate management of the menu 48 from the page 51a is illustrated by the operation of the portal pages 50a and 50b in their entirety. Namely, when a user clicks a link 86 on the page 50a, the portal server requests at least *two* types of information: "portal structure information and ... target web page information". [Spec. 14:11-14.] The portal structure information allows emulation of the menu selection, while the target web page definition provides a layout that includes defined services and/or tiles for the page. [Spec. 8:8-16.] Thus, the emulation of the menu selection is managed separately from the target page in this example. For consistency, the claims at issue are further amended to recite that the displayed navigation framework "also" includes the navigation menu.

Of the claims just discussed, independent claims 7 and 19 relate to navigation to an unregistered portal page. These claims are further amended to recite that the one of the multiple navigation options involved in the emulated selection "is not configured for navigation to any of the registered portal pages." These amendments are supported by the present disclosure, for

example by the “Default” navigation option 80 (FIG. 8). There, it is described that the Default option 80 is selected by the emulation when the user navigates to an unregistered portal page, in the described example a default page 53b. [Spec. 16:7—17:2.] The Default option 80 as illustrated and described is not configured for navigation to any of the registered portal pages. Rather, as its name indicates, it is a default tab associated with displaying the default page 53b which is an unregistered page. [*Id.*]

Independent claims 11 and 23 are being amended to more particularly point out that the service is being included in the portal page for generating data content, that the service is preexisting within a service provider, and that the query to be performed seeks to obtain a page identifier associated with the requested service name. These amendments are supported by the present disclosure, for example by the description relating to the service provider 21 (FIGS. 1, 2 and 5) which provides a service having a definition that can be incorporated in the target web page. [Spec. 12:20-22.] Moreover, it is described that the portal navigation service 36 (FIG. 5), when the user clicks on a link to a registered page, queries the object repository 34. [Spec. 14:9-24.] Particularly, the querying is done to determine whether any target web page provides the requested object/service (as named in object type 58), and if so a corresponding target web page identifier 56 is identified and used. [*Id.*] Thus, this supports that the query to be performed seeks to obtain a page identifier associated with the requested service name.

No new matter is added.

### **Rejection under section 102**

Claims 1-24 were rejected under § 102(b) as anticipated by the www.fool.com publication (hereafter “Motley”), which the Examiner contends was published on May 16, 2001. This rejection is rendered moot by the above amendments. Without conceding that the rejection has merit, Applicants will point to differences between the present subject matter and Motley.

Independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 recite that the navigation menu is managed separately from the first registered portal page. That is, the claims state that (at least) two pieces of information are provided from the server to the access device: 1) information to provide a display of the selected page, and 2) information causes an emulation by the navigation menu of a

selection. Particularly, the claims explicitly state that the navigation menu emulates the selection separately from the selected page.

Motley, in contrast, does not explicitly state how the tabs 64, 74 (so numbered in the copies provided with the present office action) are managed. That is, the office action contends that a user of Motley's disclosure as shown in FIG. 6 (a page relating to "Step 3: Discussion Boards") can click a link "Folders" and be presented with the screen as shown in FIG. 7 (a page relating to "Folders"). Moreover, the office action contended that the tabs 64 in that process are changed from their appearance in FIG. 6 (tab "Home" selected) to their appearance in FIG. 7 (tab "Discussion Boards" selected).

However, there is no disclosure in Motley that the tabs 64, 74 are managed separately from the respective Step 3: Discussion Boards and Folders pages. That is, Motley never states that when the user clicks the Folders link, the tabs 64, 74 emulates the selection separately from the Folders page.

Rather, it appears that the tabs 64, 74 may be part of the displayed pages themselves. That is, it is possible that the Step 3: Discussion Boards page (FIG. 6) is configured so that the tabs 64 always has the Home tab selected when the page is shown. Similarly, it is possible that the Folders page (FIG. 7) is configured so that the tabs 74 always has the Discussion Boards tab selected when the page is shown. With such an arrangement, the tabs would not be managed separately from the content of the displayed pages. Moreover, there would be no need for the additional piece of information required by the present claims, namely the information that causes an emulation by the navigation menu of a selection. In short, Motley does not teach separate management of a navigation menu and also not the use of such additional information.

It follows that Motley does not disclose or suggest at least the above features of the present independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 and their respective dependent claims.

Moreover, with regard to independent claims 7 and 19, Motley is also missing the feature that the selection being emulated is a selection of a navigation option for a default navigation page that is not configured for navigation to any of the registered portal pages. In Motley, by contrast, the selection of the link 80 (FIG. 8) leads to the "Learning Together" page (FIG. 9). But when this page is displayed, the Home tab is shown selected in Motley's tabs 90. The Home

tab, moreover, *is* configured for navigation to others of Motley's pages as discussed above (e.g. to the Step 3: Discussion Boards page).

The present independent claims 11 and 23, in turn, require that a preexisting service be assigned to a portal page. Particularly, the service is preexisting within a service provider and is included in the portal page for generating data content. For this reason, the claims explicitly recite that both the portal page and the included service are registered with the portal navigation service. Moreover, the claims state how this portal navigation service identifies the generated portal page when a service is requested: by querying for a page identifier associated with the requested service name.

Motley, in contrast, discloses no such assignment of a service and does not query for pages in the way required by the claim. First, the "service" relied on in the office action is apparently the content shown on the Folders page. However, there is no disclosure in Motley of any of these "services" being *included* in the Folders page. Rather, they are linked to from the Folders page. Also, the service included in the portal page per the present claims is assigned to the page for generating data content, something that Motley does not describe for any of the alleged services on the Folders page.

Second, the Folders page in Motley is configured so that the user can navigate to other page using links. While the link mechanism is not described in detail, Applicants submit that in common hyperlink technology an address of the target page is included in the link on the source page. That is, such navigation is not based on the name of a service being sought; rather, it uses the location of the target page. Stated in another way, hyperlinks do not involve querying for a page identifier associated with the requested service name, as required by the present claims 11 and 23.

It follows that Motley does not disclose or suggest at least the above features of the present independent claims 11 and 23 and their respective dependent claims.

## **Conclusion**

Favorable consideration of the present claims as amended is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or

Applicant : Wachholz-Prill et al.  
Serial No. : 10/815,053  
Filed : March 31, 2004  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-137001 / 2003P00531  
US

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/12/2008

/j. richard soderberg/  
J. Richard Soderberg  
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60470369.doc